



**Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Matematiche e Statistiche**

**Università degli Studi di Foggia**

---

**EXPORTING, PRODUCTIVITY AND  
MARKET INTEGRATION:  
*Italian manufacturing firms within the European  
context***

**Michele Imbruno**

**Quaderno n. 22/2008**

“Esemplare fuori commercio per il deposito legale agli effetti della legge 15 aprile 2004 n. 106”

Quaderno riprodotto al  
Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Matematiche e Statistiche  
nel mese di dicembre 2008 e  
depositato ai sensi di legge

Authors only are responsible for the content of this reprint.

---

Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Matematiche e Statistiche, Largo Papa Giovanni Paolo II, 1,  
71100 Foggia (Italy), Phone +39 0881-75.37.30, Fax +39 0881-77.56.16

# EXPORTING, PRODUCTIVITY AND MARKET INTEGRATION: *Italian manufacturing firms within the European context*

Imbruno Michele\*

*Preliminary Draft*

## Abstract

The potential linkage between international trade and economic growth is always at the core of large and intense debates amongst academic researchers and policy makers. Recently, the attention is increasingly moving towards the exporting-productivity relationship, acknowledging the important role played by the heterogeneous firms and the trade policy.

After having provided an overview of the recent theoretical and empirical literature – by focusing especially on Melitz-Ottaviano model (2008) – this paper is aimed at investigating empirically the link between exporting and firm productivity in Italy within the context of European integration. By using a panel of Italian manufacturing firms for the years 2000 and 2003, we document coherently with the theory that: firstly, exporters turn out to have a higher performance than firms solely oriented to the home market; and secondly, the average firm productivity is higher as the industry export propensity towards more integrated European markets is considered.

**Keywords:** Exporting, Productivity, Heterogeneous firms, European integration.

**JEL Classification:** D21, F14, F15

---

\* Michele Imbruno – Department of Economics, Mathematics and Statistics, University of Foggia (Italy).  
E-mail address: [m.imbruno@unifg.it](mailto:m.imbruno@unifg.it)

I am deeply grateful to Filippo Reganati (University of Sapienza – Italy) and Alasdair Smith (University of Sussex – UK) for their valuable comments and suggestions. However, I am the only responsible for the content of this paper

## 1. Introduction

The potential linkage between trade and economic growth is always at the core of intense debates amongst academic researchers and policy makers. This issue can be faced through two alternative approaches. The first analyses the correlation between trade openness and per capita GDP at a country level, i.e. whether a more open economies effectively experience higher income growth than relatively closed economies (*macroeconomic approach*). The second explores the relationship between exporting and firm performance, i.e. whether exporters turn out to be more productive than non-exporters (*microeconomic approach*).

Over the last decade, empirical and theoretical studies are increasingly focusing on the microeconomic perspective, since Bernard and Jensen (1995) documented empirically the firm heterogeneity within international trade dynamics: in fact, they found that a very small portion of US manufacturing firms were actually exporters, which turned out to be more productive, larger and more likely to survive than firms exclusively oriented to the home market. Further studies attempt to verify the causal relation between exporting and firm performance, namely whether firms self-select into international markets, as only the more productive ones are able to cover the sunk costs to entry into foreign markets, and to face foreign competition (*Self-selection hypothesis*), or alternatively – and simultaneously – whether firms become more efficient after they start exporting basically because of knowledge flows arising from their foreign buyers (*Learning-by-Exporting hypothesis*). On this, Wagner (2007a) has recently carried out a literature review, stressing that the first hypothesis was robustly supported by the empirical evidence, unlike the second hypothesis whose studies led to mixed results. This is the reason why the pioneer theoretical models interacting international trade, heterogeneous firms and imperfect competition (Bernard et al. (2003) and Melitz (2003)) are based on the existence of the export productivity premium – meant as productivity gap between exporters and non-exporters – due to the self-selection mechanism, as well as, the aggregate productivity growth within industry due to the production reallocation mechanism – i.e. economic activity reallocation from the least productive firms to the most productive ones – in turn, connected to the fall in trade costs.

More recently, theoretical and empirical studies have explored other firm characteristics that, in some way, can explain international trade dynamics: such as differences in markups (rather than productivity or size), activities diversification (by allowing for the number of traded products and the number of trading country-partners), geo-economic orientation of exports (e.g. by distinguishing export propensity towards developed and developing countries), import behaviour and FDI behaviour.

Since the positive relationship between trade and economic performance – in particular between exports and firm productivity – has been empirically confirmed, an important role is played by trade policy. Indeed, part of the latest literature focuses on the exporting-productivity link with increasing degrees of trade openness and integration, beginning from the first form of trade liberalization, a decrease in trade tariffs, up to complete international economic integration (see Tybout (2003) for an empirical literature review).

On this, Melitz and Ottaviano (2008) develop an ‘all-comprehensive’ theoretical framework, which introduces firm heterogeneity – in productivity terms – and endogenous markups – linked to the ‘toughness’ of market competition – in a monopolistically competitive model of trade, emphasizing how such features change across markets on the basis of their size, and trade integration levels (larger, more trade integrated markets exhibit larger and more productive firms, more product varieties, lower markups and lower prices), and then, studying the impact of different trade liberalization policies.

This paper is basically aimed at studying empirically the exporting-productivity linkage in Italy within the context of European integration. It is organized as follows. In the *section 2* we introduce the theory and the evidence on ‘exporting and firm productivity’, focusing mainly on the latest theoretical and empirical challenges that go beyond the direct export-productivity link, and ‘the role of policy’, considering the evolution from trade liberalization to complete international economic integration. *Section 3* describes the dataset used for the analysis. *Section 4* presents the econometric methodology, meant to investigate the relationship between firm productivity and exporting under increasing levels of market integration. *Section 5* shows the empirical results. Finally, in the *section 6*, we draw our conclusion on the basis of our findings, providing some policy recommendations.

## 2. Theory and evidence

### 2.1. Exporting and firm productivity

Over the last decade, a large number of empirical studies found firm heterogeneity within sector in terms of several economic performance measures – such as productivity and size – which would turn out to be strongly correlated with the firm decision to engage in international activities – such as exporting, importing, direct investing abroad (in particular, see Greenaway and Kneller (2005) for a survey). This is the reason why many researchers have begun to develop new theoretical frameworks on international trade by removing the assumption of a representative firm within sector<sup>1</sup> and moving the attention from country/industry to firm/product perspective. Bernard et al. (2003) – by referring to the multi-country Ricardian model – and Melitz (2003) – by being based on Krugman's model of intra-industry trade – can be considered as the pioneers of the so-called 'new new trade theory' where firm heterogeneity assumes a basic role to explain the international trade dynamics.

In particular, the Melitz's model can be considered the actual turning point, since it turns out to be particularly tractable as well as the basis for further theoretical implications concerning international trade<sup>2</sup>. It incorporates two main mechanisms: *self selection*, i.e. solely the most productive firms are able to serve the foreign markets because of the presence of the sunk costs to entry, and *resources reallocation* since the trade openness leads to a resources shift from less to more productive firms within industry, causing an increase in industry aggregate productivity.

More recently, several researchers face the causality problem related to export status and firm performance, since the exporter productivity premium – productivity gap between exporters and non-exporters – can be due to the self-selection mechanism on the one hand, and the *learning-by-exporting effect* on the other hand, i.e. firm's trade openness would determine improvements in terms of productivity given that exporting is per se considered to be a channel for knowledge transfer. These two hypotheses are not necessarily mutually exclusive, in the sense that if one occurs, this does not imply that

---

<sup>1</sup> One of essential assumptions of the old (such as Ricardian and Heckscher-Ohlin models) and new (Dixit-Stiglitz, 1977; Krugman, 1979; and Helpman & Krugman, 1985) trade theories.

<sup>2</sup> Helpman, Melitz and Yeaple (2004), Bernard, Redding and Schott (2007), Greenaway and Yu (2004), Melitz and Ottaviano (2008), Yeaple (2005), Helpman, Melitz and Rubinstein (2007), and Chaney (2007).

the other one cannot also occur. For instance, Aw, Roberts and Winston (2007) find out the coexistence of both hypothesis, by using panel data related to the Taiwanese electronics industry for the years 1986, 1991 and 1996. In fact, their findings highlight that the export decision is positively affected by both firm's performance and prior international experience – supporting the existence of sunk costs to enter in foreign markets and the related self-selection mechanism – as well as the positive linkage between firm's export status and its future productivity, which is in turn enhanced through R&D investments – sustaining the learning-by-exporting hypothesis and the role of firm investments aimed at improving the absorptive capacity for new technologies coming from foreign customers.

However, reviewing numerous empirical studies on the issue and confirming the existence of export productivity premium in all cases, Wagner (2007a) notes as the results related pre-entry differences in performance between exporters and non-exporters are always significant – coherently with the self-selection hypothesis – whereas the results relative to post-entry productivity gap between the two categories turn out to be mixed, supporting only partially the learning-by-exporting hypothesis. Hence, he reaches the conclusion that *'exporters are more productive than non-exporters, and the more productive firms self-select into export markets, while exporting does not necessarily improve productivity'*. A recent empirical study in line with this conclusion is those carried out by Imbruno (2008), which – using firm-level data on Italian manufacturing sector for the years 2000 and 2003 – investigates both hypotheses and essentially find that exporters are more productive than non-exporters before but not after the entry into foreign markets, stressing further that the export productivity premium needed to enter is almost twofold higher compared with the export productivity premium required to keep the presence in foreign markets.

Nevertheless, cross-country comparisons, and even cross-study comparisons for one country, are difficult through a 'simple' survey of several empirical studies, since the latter adopt different approaches and methodologies. Therefore, in order to generate stylised facts in a more convincing way, the International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2007) define a common approach and estimate the identical empirical models, using comparable firm level panel data for 14 countries (Austria, Belgium, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Republic of Ireland, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom). Their findings are coherent with Wagner (2007a) statement, and also document different exporter premiums across countries,

which turn out to be positively connected with countries' trade openness and government effectiveness.

The literature has recently moved towards other aspects of firm heterogeneity and international trade. Some studies consider *other characteristics* (apart from productivity and size) that vary at a firm level, which in some way explain why solely some firms are involved in export activities (such as markups). Other studies focus on particular behaviours of firms involved in international activities (such as product and country diversification, import behaviour, geo-economic orientation and FDI behaviour). Some recent investigations are reported below.

- ***Exporting and markups.*** By referring to a simplified version of Melitz-Ottaviano model<sup>3</sup> and using firm-level data for the French manufacturing sector from 1986 to 2004, Bellone, Musso, and Nesta (2008) estimate firm' price cost margins, by relating them to productivity and export intensity at a firm level, and to market size and import penetration ratio at the industry level. They see that markups are higher for more productive firms and exporting firms, and lower in larger domestic markets and in industries with stronger import penetration. In addition, they find counter-cyclical markups – by controlling for GDP growth – and pro-competitive effect of the Single Market Program – by adding simply an interactive dummy Post1992.
- ***Product and Country diversification.*** Some studies focus on the diversification of firms' activities, by allowing for the number of traded products and the number of countries where they trade (the so-called *product and country extensive margins*). Andersson, Johansson and Lööf (2007) investigate the link between firm performance and international trade in the Swedish manufacturing sector, having at their disposal firm-level data for the period 1997-2004. After having compared Sweden (a small open economy) with the U.S. and France (large open economies) data, finding out several similarities, they estimate export and import productivity premiums – recognizing in both cases that they may be due to self-selection hypothesis and/or post-entry effects – which have appeared to be significant and of an analogous magnitude. In addition, their results reveal that such trade productivity premiums are increasing in both number of traded goods

---

<sup>3</sup> The theoretical framework of Melitz and Ottaviano (2008) will be examined in the next section.

and number of trading partner countries, confirming that only highly-productive firms are able to offer different products – associated with different levels of fixed cost and profitability – and serve in several countries – associated with asymmetric sunk costs to entry (as in Chaney (2007) and Helpman et al. (2007))<sup>4</sup>. Indeed, less performing firms would limit themselves to offer a few products connected to low levels of fixed costs, in a restricted number of markets with low productivity thresholds.

By considering plant-level data of German manufacturing sector in 2004, Wagner (2007b) explores the relationship between firm performance and exporting, considering the export market size. In particular, he notices that firms selling abroad but exclusively within the Eurozone are more productive than firms solely oriented to the home market and less productive than firms exporting outside the Eurozone too. Thus, he proves that the higher entry costs related to the market outside the Eurozone can be paid only by the most productive firms.

- **Import behaviour.** More recently, attention has been extended to the *import behaviour of firms*, for which similar productivity-related hypothesis may be distinguished: in the sense that the positive correlation between import-status and economic performance, retrieved in several empirical studies, might be due to the *self-selection mechanism* – since importers may sustain sunk costs in order to establish some relationships with foreign suppliers (for example, costs related to market surveys, new workers with international communication skills, and so on) – or the *learning-by-importing hypothesis* – when import firms attain some benefits in performance terms, deriving from the higher quality of foreign inputs, the implicit transfer of know-how embodied in imported intermediate and capital goods, etc.

In particular, by using longitudinal data on approximately 20.000 Italian manufacturing firms over the 1993-1997 period, Castellani, Serti and Tomasi

---

<sup>4</sup> Helpman et al. (2007) and Chaney (2007) define a theoretical model, combining Melitz's model with a gravity equation for bilateral trade, aimed at capturing the trade costs effects on both the extensive and intensive margins of trade. In both models, self-selection mechanism operates market by market, bearing in mind that trade costs vary across countries and each firm will export to a given country if the country-specific productivity threshold is lower than its productivity level. In other words, the higher productivity firms are assumed to be able to serve simultaneously many more markets characterized by different levels of trade costs.



(2008) document that imports and exports are more concentrated than employment and sales. Furthermore, they analyse the intensive (in terms of traders number and the intensity of their activities) and extensive margins (in terms of both product and geographical diversification) in firms' international trade, finding that: a) few firms detain high trade shares predominantly within the sector, rather than in different sectors (confirming the most recent trade theory about heterogeneous firms, rather than the traditional trade theory linked to the comparative advantage); b) few firms trade in many sectors and with many countries, taking into consideration these diversified traders account for the majority of exports and imports. Finally, they ascertain that traders are more productive than domestically-oriented firms and this may be due to both pre-entry and post-entry effects: in particular, the two-way traders – firms which simultaneously buy and sell abroad – appear to be the most productive, while the only-importers seem to perform better than only-exporters, stressing that the relatively high performance of only-importers is more associated to the self-selection mechanism, rather than the other hypothesis<sup>5</sup>.

- ***Geo-economic orientation.*** The *geo-economic orientation (source) of exports (imports)* is considered relevant to explain firm heterogeneity in productivity in several empirical studies, emphasizing particularly the role of different markets' characteristics, apart from the extent of trade barriers, such as distance, size, income, language, legal and institutional structures. By referring to Slovenian exporters, Damijan et al. (1998) show that the productivity level required to serve developing countries is lower than one required to export towards developed economies.

By using firm-level data of the Italian manufacturing sector over the years 1993-1997, Serti and Tomasi (2008) show the existence of trade premium in productivity, size, capital and skilled intensity and that two-way trading firms are

---

<sup>5</sup> Anyhow, in this case, they focus on the effects of imports of intermediate inputs on firm performance – having firm-level data available on the acquisition of intermediates inputs abroad – which are assumed to be positive. However, if we consider the impact related to imports of final goods on firms within an industry – measured by the link between industry import penetration ratio and import-competing firm's productivity (Tybout, 2003) – the relationship between imports and productivity could change, in the sense that it could have a negative sign. In fact, if domestic firms are highly productive compared to foreign ones within a given sector, then imports of intermediate inputs at a firm level will increase, while imports of final goods at the industry level will decrease.

more strongly performing than firms involved in either exporting or importing only. In a second step, they alight on possible heterogeneity of firms due to trading with different type of markets, having at disposal information about geographic destination (origin) of firms' exports of output (imports of intermediate inputs). They find that firms exporting to European countries are less productive than exporters direct towards other destinations – stressing that the possible reason could be the lower productivity level needed to enter in those markets due to lower sunk costs – and some learning-by-exporting effects occur only for exporters oriented towards developed economies. Conversely, importers sourcing from Europe seem to be more performing under several aspects – probably because they mainly buy high-tech capital goods there – and at the same time, affected by *learning-by-importing* effects.

- **FDI behaviour.** All arguments about export behaviour of firms have been subsequently extended to *FDI behaviour of firms*. In particular, Helpman, Melitz and Yeaple (2004) develop a theoretical model where the firms' export and FDI decisions are related to economic performance. They assume that FDI is horizontal (or market seeking) – occurring when the same stage of production is located abroad – and alternative respect to exports. In addition the sunk costs to enter into the foreign market is higher through FDI rather than exporting. In other words, firms self-select into international markets by considering different penetration channels: the higher productivity firms will become exporters, but the best ones will establish directly some subsidiaries abroad. However, several empirical studies have already paid attention to cases un contemplated within the model: *i)* vertical (or factor seeking) FDI, occurring when different stages of production are located in foreign country; *ii)* complementarity between FDI and exports – existing, for example, when the firm produce several product lines, which are horizontally or vertically interrelated – and finally, *iii)* the case where exporting is more costly than foreign investing, e.g. when the foreign country is small, but abundant of factor intensively used by domestic firms.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> See the survey of Greenaway and Kneller (2005) for more details and some empirical studies.

## 2.2. The role of policy: trade liberalization and economic integration

If firms increase their productivity with the intent on entering international markets, then any policy aimed at affecting a firms' decision to export – such as removal of non-tariff barriers<sup>7</sup> or export-promotion policies<sup>8</sup> – generates automatically relevant effects on the firm-level productivity. Indeed, part of recent empirical literature focuses on the *relationship between exporting and productivity as trade openness is increasing (because trade costs are decreasing)*. Thus, welfare gains from trade may be magnified if the increased competition induced by trade liberalization leads to higher productivity and lower markups, which in turn contribute to the fall in prices and the increase in real incomes.

A large number of studies find an increase in aggregate productivity following trade liberalization policies in developing countries, due to the survival and further growth of more productive firms. These cases could be considered unreliable since trade liberalization is only a part of important economic reforms.

However, similar results are found in developed countries. For instance, Bernard, Jensen and Schott (2006) show that a fall in trade costs determines an increase in probability of exiting and of exporting among US non-exporting plants and hence a reallocation of economic activities in favour of more productive exporting firms, causing a rise in average industry productivity. While, Trefler (2004) finds positive effects of tariff reductions on industry productivity in Canada, because of both market share

---

<sup>7</sup> The removal of trade restrictions across countries raises the profitability of becoming exporter and thus, the opportunity of enhancing the productivity.

<sup>8</sup> For example, they have been adopted by South-East Asian economies (Korea and Taiwan) where high rates of economic growth were associated to large human and physical capital accumulation and high volume of exports. Some studies argue that the major role for accelerated economic growth was played by the increase in TFP through exporting – being the main channel of technology/knowledge diffusion – whereas others state that increased exports are an effect rather than the cause of growth, since capital accumulation was the first determinant. For instance, Rodrik (1997) suggests that in South-East Asia an increase in profitability of investment determined an increase in imports – since most capital goods were imported – which in turn, would have implied an increase in exports, since economy could not borrow freely from abroad. In addition, he states that the profitability of exports was not relevant (having only considered direct subsidies to exports and not also indirect ones, such as public financial support for long-term investment, R&D, etc.).

Furthermore, we should take into account *i*) the *export spillovers*, given that exporting firms can generate technology/knowledge which can be used by other firms within the same or different sector; and *ii*) *other benefits*, since exporting can induce *technology licensing* from abroad and as well as an increase in *real wage* (which would attract workers educated and trained abroad, allowing knowledge transfer). Hence, more attention should be paid to the causal link from exporting to economic growth, by deepening the *learning-by-exporting* hypothesis and the role of *export externalities* (López, 2005).

reallocation in favour of higher-performance plants and resources reallocation across activities within plants.

On this matter, we can turn to the recent ‘all-comprehensive’ theoretical framework originated by Melitz and Ottaviano (2008), which introduces firm heterogeneity – in productivity terms<sup>9</sup> – and endogenous markups – linked to the ‘toughness’ of competition in a market<sup>10</sup> – into a monopolistically competitive model of trade, emphasizing how such features change across markets on the basis of their size and trade integration level (larger, more trade integrated markets exhibit larger and more productive firms, more product varieties, lower markups and lower prices), and then, studying the impact of different trade liberalization policies<sup>11</sup>.

In particular, they start by analysing a closed economy, stressing that larger market is associated with larger and more productive firms, many more product varieties and lower markups (thus, lower prices). Then, they consider the open economy version with two (or more) countries, showing that costly trade entails a partial integration between markets, and therefore, the effects of market size differences across trading partners persist: the bigger domestic market is, the more productive firms, more numerous product varieties and the lower markups (prices) are. Thus, the total removal of trade costs within the open economy model would be exactly equivalent to an increase in market size in the closed economy model, under the profile of effects.

This means that benefits stemming from the enlargement process of a trade bloc (i.e. an increase in the number of trading partners) tend to intensify following the related integration process (i.e. further decrease in trade costs, for instance, by removing non-tariff barriers, in addition to already dropped trade tariffs). Indeed, they lastly consider the stimulating role of trade liberalization<sup>12</sup> in market shares reallocation in favour of the most productive firms (exporters) and at the expense of the least productive ones

---

<sup>9</sup> As in the Melitz (2003) model.

<sup>10</sup> The competition toughness in a market is measured by the number and average productivity of competing firms in that market.

<sup>11</sup> Different other theoretical studies have been developed to show the impact of trade liberalization on productivity. For instance, Long, Raff and Stahler (2007) define an oligopolistic model of international trade with heterogeneous firms and endogenous R&D where they identify four effects of trade liberalization on firm and industry productivity – a direct effect (linked to changes in R&D investment), a scale effect, a selection effect and a market share reallocation effect – which operate when market structure is fixed (in the short run) or variable (in the long run).

<sup>12</sup> In both bilateral and asymmetric (unilateral or preferential) terms.

(stoppers) – thus in aggregate productivity growth – which is basically due to increased import competition (rather than enhanced competition for scarce domestic labour resources, as in Melitz’s model<sup>13</sup>). In addition, they show that such productivity gains arising from pro-competitive effects in the short run, can be offset or even overturned in the long run, because of harder patterns of entry – i.e. the smaller proportion of entrants – which in turn entails less competition (*anti-competitive effects*) .

Moreover, their model remains tractable even when it is extended to the case with more asymmetric countries integrated to different levels through asymmetric trade costs. Therefore, this model can be considered highly suitable to analyse trade and regional integration policy scenarios in a context of firm heterogeneity and markup endogeneity, bearing in mind that the profitable link between firm performance and trade intensifies as the extent of economic integration of trade bloc increases. For instance, the passage from the *custom union phase* to the *single market phase*, entails the free movement of production inputs (labour and capital), which in turn would determine a fall in input costs, and thus, a widespread improvement in terms of economic performance, within the involved regional area. Besides, the passage from the *single market phase* to the *monetary union phase*, through the introduction of a single currency, should enhance further trade integration (and consequently, the related positive productivity effects), since costs and risks related to exchange rates vanish. Hence, firms notice simultaneously an increase in productivity and a decrease in trade costs, which induce them to start or intensify exporting activities.


---

<sup>13</sup> In the *Melitz’s model (2003)*, import competition has no role in the reallocation process (indeed, CES specification for demand implies that residual demand price elasticities are exogenously fixed and unaffected by import competition): the exposure to export market induces increased competition for scarce domestic labour resources as real wages are bid up by the more productive firms which expand production to serve the foreign markets. This increase in labour cost forces the least productive firms to exit. Hence, it contains an important channel for the redistributive effects of trade within industries.

Conversely, in the *Melitz-Ottaviano model (2008)*, the impact of two channels is reversed: increased factor market competition plays no role (since the supply of labour to the differentiated goods sector is perfectly elastic), and enhanced product market competition is the only operative channel (by shifting up residual demand price elasticities for all firms at any given demand level, forcing the least productive firms to exit). Although only relatively more productive firms survive (with higher markup than the less productive firms to exit), we have a downward shift in the average markup. The distribution of prices then shifts down due to the combined effect of selection and lower markups, whereas firms size, profits, product variety increase. Thus, in this model, welfare gains from trade come from a combination of productivity gains (via selection), lower markups (pro-competitive effect) and increased product variety.


We can represent the whole Meltiz-Ottaviano's story through a series of diagrams, by starting from the Closed Economy case up to the case of Totally Integrated Economy at an international level (see **Box 1**).

**Box 1 - Transition from a Closed Economy to a Totally Integrated Economy by diagrams**



**Figure 1 - Closed Economy**

This shows the firms operating within a **Closed Economy** distributed according to the productivity level (LP), which lies between the minimum value necessary to make non-negative profits (the 'zero-profit productivity cutoff' ( $LP_{dom}$ )) and the maximum value reached by the most competitive firms ( $LP_{max}$ ).




**Figure 2 - Trade liberalization: from closed economy to open economy**

This shows what happens following the **trade liberalization process**, i.e. the transition from 'Closed Economy' to 'Open Economy', through for instance, a fall in tariff trade barriers.

We can observe a generalized increase in productivity for all domestic firms, due to import competition effect. Nevertheless, the least productive firms are forced to exit from the market since they are not absolutely able to face the foreign competitors, the whose presence has basically pushed further the  $LP_{dom}$  upwards. Withal, solely the firms whose the productivity


level is above a given higher threshold ('export productivity cutoff' ( $LP_{exp}$ )) will be able to export, because of the sunk costs to entry into international market (self-selection mechanism): thus, they will see a strong increase in productivity, given that the foreign market shares will sum up to domestic ones. Finally, the intermediate firms, although not having the minimum requirements to serve export market, are able to compete domestically with foreign presence, namely to keep their own – even if reduced – home market share.. Therefore, we will notice a business reallocation domestically from less productive firms (predominantly, exiting firms) to more productive ones (essentially, exporters). All these mechanisms – self-selection, import-competition and business reallocation – imply an increase in average aggregate productivity and the existence of export productivity premium (i.e. productivity gap between exporters and non-exporters).



**Figure 3** – Trade integration: from *open economy* to *partially integrated economy*

This depicts a further step: the **trade integration process**, i.e. the passage from ‘Open Economy’ to ‘Partially Integrated Economy’, through for example, the complete and reciprocal removal of tariff and non-tariff trade barriers. It entails again a generalized rise in firms’ productivity associated with an increase in  $LP_{dom}$  – due to more intensive foreign competition within the domestic market – on the one hand, and a smaller increase in  $LP_{exp}$  – due to the combination of two contrasting effects: a fall in trade costs (implying a decrease in  $LP_{exp}$ ) and an enhancement in foreign competition in more integrated international market (implying an

increase in  $LP_{exp}$ ) – on the other hand. All mechanisms mentioned above heighten, causing a further increase in average productivity, a decrease in export-productivity premium – by assuming the same foreign competition intensity inside and outside the domestic market – and a relatively higher proportion of exporters



**Figure 4** – Economic integration: from *partially integrated economy* to *totally integrated economy* (equivalent to an increase in domestic market size)

This describes the **economic integration process**, i.e. the shift from ‘Partially Integrated Economy’ to ‘Totally Integrated Economy’, occurring when each kind of barrier between countries is removed, for example, by imposing the free movement of inputs (capital and labour) across countries, the introduction of a single currency, etc. The cutoffs shifts – with the related mechanisms and effects – described in the previous figure, amplify further until when they exactly coincide with a single cutoff, stressing that all existing firms will tend to serve also the foreign market, which together with the domestic one, constitute a single larger market.

Considering the Melitz-Ottaviano model and firm-level panel data of 11 EU countries, Del Gatto, Mion and Ottaviano (2006) study the impact of trade integration on aggregate productivity in the presence of firm selection. They explore two scenarios:

- i) the productivity losses associated with autarky (*cost of non-Europe*) – where they find out that following an increase in trade barriers to prohibitive levels in 2000, average productivity would decrease by 13 percent, average markups and prices would rise by 16 percent and average profits would drop by 23 percent – and
- ii) the productivity gains stemming from further integration (*gains from freer trade*) – where they notice as a 5 percent fall in trade barriers in 2000, would cause a rise in average productivity and profits by 2 percent and 5 percent respectively, and falls in average markups and prices by 2 percent.

More generally, they argue that productivity gains vary considerably across countries and sectors relying on market accessibility and trade costs: *‘the Darwin selection of the best firms is an important effect of trade liberalization’*.

Corcos, Del Gatto, Mion and Ottaviano (2007) attempt at quantifying the gains from trade in EU countries, deriving from the complete removal of their ‘behind-the-border’ trade barriers (BTBs)<sup>14</sup>, beyond what the Single Market Program (SMP) has already achieved in terms of non-tariff barriers (NTBs). They calibrate and simulate the Melitz-Ottaviano model (2008) by using firm-level panel data from 11 EU countries, where a country (France) has been broken up into 21 regional economies. In particular, they explore three different scenarios:

- i) *Costs of non-Europe*, where productivity losses linked to international autarky are highlighted. The related simulation and results are similar to the previous study.
- ii) *Costs of non-France*, where they find that if in 2000, trade had been inhibited amongst French regions and between each French region and EU countries, average regional productivity would have dropped by 25 percent and 8 percent respectively. Thus, ‘non-France’ generates larger productivity losses than ‘non-Europe’ for an average French region<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> BTBs are related to domestic regulations about government procurement, product standards, inward foreign investment, competition law, labour standards and environmental norms.

<sup>15</sup> For a large country (as France) intra-national competition is thus more important than competition arising from its main international partners in determining firm survival, selection and productivity. However, the results could be different for small countries (like Belgium and Netherlands), and/or the effect of total international trade is considered.



iii) *United Europe*, where they document that if BTBs among EU countries were removed, by setting the thickness of borders between EU countries at the same level as between French regions, average trade costs would fall by 34 percent. This in turn would imply an increase in average productivity and profits by 20 percent and 60 percent respectively, and a fall in prices and markups by 13 percent. In addition, the productivity gain for the average French region would round on 9 percent<sup>16</sup>.

They reach the conclusion that the further behind-the-border integration in the EU – through the removal of BTBs – would imply relevant benefits, firstly, in the form of substantial productivity gains.

Lileeva and Trefler (2007) participate in the debate about the causality link between exporting and productivity growth and the role of regional integration, using panel data from Canadian manufacturing plants related to the years 1984 and 1996 (all of which did not export in the first year, whereas almost half resulted to be exporters in the second year), and therefore, considering the impact of U.S. tariff reductions under the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (FTA), went into effect in 1989. The two authors find that the tariff cuts encourage lower-productivity firms to export and invest in economic performance enhancement, simultaneously – indeed, as a result, they are also able to increase their domestic market share at the expense of non-exporters – unlike higher-productivity firms, which are solely induced to export without investing further (as in Melitz, 2003).

De Hoyos and Iacovone (2006) study the impact of economic integration on the trade-productivity linkage, by analysing Mexican manufacturing firms – discriminated according to a different ‘integration status’: i.e. firms involved in two-way trading, solely in exporting, only in importing intermediate inputs and exclusively in domestic market – in the context of NAFTA reforms, over the period 1993-2000. They notice that the increased industry productivity linked to NAFTA reforms is mainly due to changes in

---

<sup>16</sup> There is a considerable heterogeneity in terms of productivity gains across countries, from 1,17% (Portugal) to 60,18% (Germany). With regard to France, the productivity gain deriving from international trade would be around 17% (actual 9% + hypothetical 8%), much closer to 25% productivity gain coming from intra-national trade: thus, for a large country, like France, international trade is likely to become the main channel through which competition and selection stimulate productivity growth.

economic performance within firm – rather than market share reallocation across firms – remarking a certain firm heterogeneity, on the basis of dissimilar integration status.

### 3. Data description

The empirical study is based mainly on a balanced panel of Italian manufacturing firms used and provided by Morone, Petraglia and Testa (2007), which is the result of a combination of two data sources: Capitalia<sup>17</sup> surveys and AIDA<sup>18</sup> database. In particular, the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> Capitalia surveys concern the periods 1998-2000 and 2001-2003 respectively and deal with all firms with more than 500 employees and a sample of firms with 11-500 employees – which has been determined using a random selection procedure by allowing for firm size<sup>19</sup>, location<sup>20</sup> and sectors<sup>21</sup> – within the Italian manufacturing sector: therefore, not all firms appear in both surveys. Despite the loss of some observations, the matching procedure has been executed, in order to have the continuity of observations over time. Next, AIDA data on further economic and financial characteristics have been added<sup>22</sup>.

Nevertheless, the composition of the resultant balanced panel – made up of 1070 firms – fairly reflects that of samples observed by both Capitalia surveys, which in turn, reasonably reproduce the characteristics of the Italian economy on the whole. As we can

---

<sup>17</sup> Capitalia was an Italian banking group which agreed to be taken over by the Unicredit group, in may 2007.

<sup>18</sup> AIDA is a Bureau Van Dijk's databank which provides economic and financial data of about 500.000 firms operating in Italian territory.

<sup>19</sup> Five dimensional categories were distinguished: a) 11-20 employees, b) 21-50 employees, c) 51-250 employees, d) 251-500 employees and finally e) more than 500 employees.

<sup>20</sup> Four geo-economic locations were discerned: a) *North West* (Valle d'Aosta, Piemonte, Lombardia and Liguria); b) *North East* (Trentino Alto-Adige, Veneto, Friuli Venezia Giulia and Emilia Romagna); c) *Center* (Toscana, Umbria, Marche and Lazio); and d) *South* (Abruzzo, Molise, Puglia, Campania, Basilicata, Calabria, Sicilia and Sardegna).

<sup>21</sup> Four sector categories were identified by considering the Pavitt (1984) taxonomy: a) *Traditional sector* (textiles, footwear, food and beverages, wood, paper and printing); b) *Specialized suppliers sector* (machinery and equipment; office, accounting and computing machinery; medical, precision and optical instruments); c) *Scale-intensive sector* (basic metals; motor-vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers); and d) *High-tech sector* (chemicals; pharmaceuticals and electronics). The first two industry categories are basically composed of small-medium enterprises and are connected to one another, since the first one acquires innovative tools essential to carry out its activities from other sectors, whereas the second one is involved in producing innovative tools aimed to satisfy the needs in other sectors. Whereas, the last two industries include mainly medium-large firms characterized by highly-standardized productive processes with relevant economies of scale and high intensity of R&D activities, respectively.

<sup>22</sup> For more details about the dataset construction, see Morone, Petraglia and Testa (2007).

see from the **Table 1**, almost half of firms (about 47.85%) are concentrated in *traditional sectors*, while about 30 percent are included in *specialized suppliers sectors*. The remaining 25 percent are firms operating in *scale-intensive sectors* (about 17.57%) and *high-tech sectors* (about 4.67%). On the firm size side: about 70 percent of our sample is composed of small firms (no more than 50 employees) and about one-fourth is represented by medium enterprises (no more than 250 employees); finally, the large firms (more than 250 employees) are just around 8.32 percent. Furthermore, they are especially located in Northern Italy (around 67%), the residual one-third is predominantly situated in the Center of Italy (about 21%): indeed, just 12.06 percent are Southern firms. Hence, our sample is exactly in line with the Italian economic reality, where the manufacturing sector is mainly made up of small-medium firms operating in Traditional and Specialized suppliers industries and located in North of the Country.

**Table 1 – Sector, geographical and dimensional composition of the sample**

	<b>N=1070</b>
<b>SECTORS</b>	
<i>Traditional (or supplier dominated)</i>	47,85%
<i>Scale intensive</i>	17,57%
<i>Specialized suppliers</i>	29,91%
<i>High-tech (or science based)</i>	4,67%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,00%</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	
<i>North-West</i>	35,79%
<i>North-East</i>	31,40%
<i>Center</i>	20,75%
<i>South</i>	12,06%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,00%</b>
<b>SIZE</b>	
<i>11--20</i>	32,34%
<i>21--50</i>	37,48%
<i>51--250</i>	21,87%
<i>251--500</i>	4,21%
<i>more than 500</i>	4,11%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

The dataset described above provides information about several firms' characteristics and balance sheet data, but for the purpose of our study we utilize

specifically: sales, number of employees, exporter status, engagement in R&D activities, net fixed assets, total labour cost, industry and geographical location. Finally, trade data at a 3-digit sector-level collected by Istat<sup>23</sup> (total exports and exports according to geo-economic destination: EU-25<sup>24</sup>, EU-15<sup>25</sup> and EMU-12<sup>26</sup>) have also been used.

Different data sources have different systems of industry classification: in particular, the firm-level panel data of Capitalia merged with AIDA data are classified by *5-digit Ateco 1991*, whereas Istat data are classified by *3-digit Ateco 2002*. In order to make them compatible, Ateco 1991 codes have been converted in Ateco 2002 ones using a conversion table (source: Istat), taking into account that we use the 3-digit level aggregation and at this level, the two Ateco classifications are very similar (the only changes are listed in the **Appendix 1**).

In addition, where necessary, the data have been converted from Lira to Euros and from Euro-thousands to Euro-units in order to have a homogenous unit of measurement. Finally, all variables expressed in current prices have been transformed into constant prices by using value added industry output deflators of Southern and Northern Italy (source: SVIMEZ<sup>27</sup>): thus, we handle real data.

However, since the knowledge of whether the firm exports or not – relevant information for our analysis – is known just for the last year of each Capitalia survey, we were compelled to focus our attention only on the years 2000 and 2003. From **Table 2**, we can see that in both years the percentage of exporters is around 72 percent, and consequently that of non-exporters is around 28 percent. More specifically, 67.12 percent of sample firms are always involved in export activities, whereas 23.16 percent are always domestic-market-oriented, in both years. The remaining share (9.72%) appear to have changed exporter status: one-half were exporters in 2000 and no longer in 2003, conversely the other half result to be exporters in 2003 but were not in 2000.

---

<sup>23</sup> Italian National Institute of Statistics.

<sup>24</sup> EU-25 can be defined as ‘Enlarged Europe’ since it includes the Members States (MSs) of European Union until 2003 and the next MSs joined in 2004 (Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom).

<sup>25</sup> EU-15 is the European Union in 2003 (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom).

<sup>26</sup> EMU-12 is the Eurozone in 2003 (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal and Spain).

<sup>27</sup> SVIMEZ is an Italian association for the industry development in South of Italy.

**Table 2 – Export status of the sample**

TRADE ORIENTATION	N=1070
<i>exporters in 2000</i>	72,18%
<i>non-exporters in 2000</i>	27,82%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,00%</b>
<i>exporters in 2003</i>	72,00%
<i>non-exporters in 2003</i>	28,00%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,00%</b>
<i>always exporters</i>	67,12%
<i>always non-exporters</i>	23,16%
<i>entrants in export market</i>	4,86%
<i>firms exiting from export market</i>	4,86%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

#### 4. Econometric methodology<sup>28</sup>

The following empirical methodology basically derives from methods proposed by the International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2007) and Machin (1996).

Firstly, it is aimed at exploring the connection between firm-level labour productivity and the ‘relative industry export propensity’ towards Enlarged Europe, as well as whether there are some differences between exporters and non-exporters through the estimation of the *exporter productivity premium* ( $\hat{\beta}_2$ )<sup>29</sup>, assuming a log-lin functional form<sup>30</sup> and allowing for the balanced panel of just two years distant over time (2000, denoted  $t=0$ , and 2003, denoted  $t=1$ ) at our disposal.

<sup>28</sup> All econometric definitions have been drawn by Gujarati (2004) and Greene (2003) textbooks.

<sup>29</sup> In this context, the problem of causality between firm productivity and exporter status has been neglected: thus the export productivity premium – productivity gap between exporters and non-exporters – could be due to pre-entry and/or post-entry differences, i.e. self-selection and/or learning-by-exporting hypotheses. However, this problem was faced by Imbruno (2008) by using the same dataset and similar econometric model.

<sup>30</sup> This is the semilog model where the regressand Y appears in the logarithmic form and the regressors X are expressed in linear form:  $\ln Y = a + b X$ . It is considered the natural form for models with dummy variables and the most appropriate model, when we want to know the rate of growth of a certain economic variable (as productivity) respect to the other variables. The related slope coefficient  $b$  measures the relative change in Y for a given absolute change in X: indeed, by using differential calculus, we can show that  $b = d(\ln Y)/dX = (1/Y)/(dY/dX) = (dY/Y)/dX$ . By multiplying  $b$  by 100, we will obtain the percentage change in Y for an absolute change in X, namely the *instantaneous rate of growth* (known also as the semielasticity of Y with respect to X). Finally, if we want to know the *compound rate of growth*, we should use the following formula:  $(e^b - 1) * 100$ .

$$\ln LP_{ijt} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 T_t + \hat{\beta}_2 EXPORTER_{ijt} + \hat{\beta}_3 EU25_{jt} + \hat{\beta}_4 CONTROLS_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (1)$$

for  $t = 0, 1; i = 1, \dots, n; j = 1, \dots, m$

where

$i$  is the index of firm,  $j$  is the index of sector (or industry) and  $t$  is the index of year.

$T$  is a time dummy to allow for changes in  $\ln LP$  over time (1 if the year is 2003, 0 else).

$LP$  is the firm's labour productivity, measured as sales per employee.

$EXPORTER$  is a dummy variable which assumes the value 1 if the firm exports and 0 otherwise.

$EU25$  measures the *Industry relative export propensity towards Enlarged Europe* and has been computed as the ratio between 'the share of exports oriented to Enlarged Europe in total exports in each sector' and 'the share of exports oriented to Enlarged Europe in total export in the whole manufacturing sector':

$$\text{Industry relative export propensity towards Enlarged Europe } EU25_{jt} = \frac{(\text{EU25 exports/ World exports})_{jt}}{\sum_j \text{EU25 exports}_t / \sum_j \text{World exports}_t} \quad (2)$$

CONTROLS are control variables at a firm level:

- R&D is a dummy variable which assumes the value 1 if the firm is involved in R&D activities and 0 otherwise;
- (K/L) is the capital-to-labour ratio of firm (measured as net fixed assets per employee);
- (w/L) is the pro-capita labour cost (quantified as total labour cost per employee) to proxy for the human capital.

Finally,  $\varepsilon_{ijt}$  is the error term, which is assumed to follow the classical assumptions: basically,  $\varepsilon_{ijt} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ .

When we use OLS estimators, we assume that we do not have problems of omitted variables and that the error term is not correlated with our explanatory variables, in order to have consistent estimators. This is of particular concern when we include data from both years in a *Pooled model*, where basically, intercept and slopes are assumed time-invariant and constant across individual units, while the error term simultaneously captures both individual and time differences.

The unobservable component  $\varepsilon_{ijt}$  could contain some time-constant factors affecting the dependent variable: the so-called ‘individual effects’ (such as managerial capabilities which are firm-specific and invariant over time). Thus, we can write the unobservable component of the equation (2) as:

$$\varepsilon_{ijt} = \lambda_i + \xi_{ijt} \quad (3)$$

where

$\lambda_i$  is an unobservable component affecting the firm labour productivity which does not change over time (individual effects), and

$\xi_{ijt}$  is an unobservable component affecting the firm labour productivity which does change over time (idiosyncratic component).

Then, we can rewrite the equation (1) as:

$$\ln LP_{ijt} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 T_t + \hat{\beta}_2 EXPORTER_{ijt} + \hat{\beta}_3 EU25_{jt} + \hat{\beta}_4 CONTROLS_{ijt} + \lambda_i + \xi_{ijt} \quad (4)$$

These individual effects  $\lambda_i$  could be correlated with the explanatory variables (other than the dependent variable): thus, they could make our coefficients biased, since they are included within the error term (for instance, the managerial abilities included within the error term can affect not only the firm productivity, but also the capability to serve international markets, the propensity to invest in R&D activities, etc). A remedy to this problem could be the first-differentiation of the equation (4), i.e. we can difference the data over two years and consequently have a cross-section equation without individual effect component, since it is constant over time:

$$\Delta \ln LP_{ij} = \hat{\beta}_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 \Delta EXPORTER_{ij} + \hat{\beta}_3 \Delta EU25_j + \hat{\beta}_4 \Delta CONTROLS_{ij} + \Delta \xi_{ij} \quad (5)$$

In our particular case – when we have just two years – the *first-differentiated model* (5) is exactly equivalent to the *Fixed Effect* version of equation (1), where basically the individual effects are captured by the intercept term:

$$\ln LP_{ijt} = \hat{\beta}_{0i} + \hat{\beta}_1 T_t + \hat{\beta}_2 EXPORTER_{ijt} + \hat{\beta}_3 EU25_{jt} + \hat{\beta}_4 CONTROLS_{ijt} + \xi_{ijt} \quad (6)$$

In order to choose between the Pooled and Fixed Effect models, we can resort to an F-test, considering that the former is the restricted version of the latter (indeed, a single intercept is imposed to all individual units in the Pooled model respect to FE model). However, in certain cases the FE model cannot be used<sup>31</sup>, therefore it is necessary to assume that the intercept in the previous equation (6) is a random variable with a mean value of  $\hat{\beta}_0$ , rather than fixed (i.e. as  $\hat{\beta}_{0i} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \lambda_i$ , where  $\lambda_i$  is a random error term with zero mean and constant variance), i.e. consider the *Random Effect (RE) model*, which can be expressed in the form of equation (4) under given assumptions<sup>32</sup> and whose the more appropriate method is Generalized Least Squares (GLS). To check if random effects are present, we can resort to the Breusch-Pagan test under the null hypothesis of ‘no random effects’. It is not sufficient to state if the RE model is more suitable than FE model in the case where the null hypothesis is rejected, since the former also requires zero correlation between individual error component  $\lambda_i$  and regressors. The existence of the last condition is checked by the Hausman test, whose null hypothesis is exactly associated to the higher suitability of the RE compared with FE one.

In the estimations section, we will report the results of equations (1) in all model versions (Pooled, Fixed and Random).

---

<sup>31</sup> Gujarati briefly summarizes, the FE model cannot always be used, since the introduction of too many dummies can lead to the drastic loss in degrees of freedom and the possibility of multicollinearity (making precise estimation of some parameters difficult); also, some effects of time-invariant characteristics cannot be identified (such as, the impact of sex, religion, ethnicity); finally, the related estimations are based on the classical assumptions (namely,  $\epsilon_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ ), but it is sometimes necessary to assume that error variance is different for all cross-sectional units (thus, heteroskedastic), error terms are correlated over time for each individual unit (autocorrelation) or across individual units for a given time.

<sup>32</sup> Such assumptions are:  $\lambda_i \sim N(0, \sigma_\lambda^2)$ ,  $\xi_{ijt} \sim N(0, \sigma_\xi^2)$ , no correlation between the two types of errors and no autocorrelation over time and across individual units for each kind of error.



Finally, we investigate whether the exports-productivity link differs at increasing levels of market integration – from custom union (or simply, association agreement) to single market and finally monetary and economic union – since as we have seen before, not only the market size but also the extent of market integration matters in the positive relationship between exporting and firm performance: indeed, Melitz and Ottaviano (2008) theoretically show as larger, more trade integrated markets exhibit larger and more productive firms (as well as, more product varieties, lower markups and lower prices).

In our specific case-study, after having investigated whether Italian manufacturing sectors whose exports are more oriented towards the European integrated markets have higher productivity firms – stressing the LP gap between exporters and non-exporters – we focus on whether an increasing degree of market integration has a larger effect on firm productivity.

For this purpose, we will also study the relationship between firm labour productivity and industry export orientation towards European Union (EU15) and Eurozone (EMU12), alternatively and respectively, since the market becomes smaller but more integrated as we move from Enlarged Europe area (EU25) to Eurozone one. Therefore, we should run the model (1) again, simply by substituting the ‘*relative industry export propensity*’ towards geo-economic area originally considered (EU25) with those towards the new areas of interest alternatively (EU15 and EMU12):

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Industry relative export propensity} \\ \text{towards European Union} \end{array} \quad EU15_{jt} = \frac{(\text{EU15 exports/ Worldexports})_{jt}}{\sum_j \text{EU15 exports}_t / \sum_j \text{World exports}_t} \quad (7)$$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Industry relative export propensity} \\ \text{towards Eurozone} \end{array} \quad EMU12_{jt} = \frac{(\text{EMU12 exports/ Worldexports})_{jt}}{\sum_j \text{EMU12 exports}_t / \sum_j \text{World exports}_t} \quad (8)$$

In the estimations, we will be interested to compare the coefficients of the three industry relative export propensity variables – (2), (7) e (8) – within the respective equations, taking into account that the economic integration mechanism would matter

more than the market enlargement process in the export-productivity relationship if we obtained  $\hat{\beta}_2^{EU25} \leq \hat{\beta}_2^{EU15} \leq \hat{\beta}_2^{EMU12}$ , and vice versa: in fact, Eurozone is a smaller but more integrated area (12 Member States in Economic and Monetary Union) than European Union (15 Member States in Single Market), which in turn is less large and more integrated compared with Enlarged Europe ('25 Member States in Custom Union').

## 5. Empirical results

In this section, we will report all the results from the previous regression models taking into consideration that they are not concerned by the heteroskedasticity problem<sup>33</sup>.

Firstly, we focus on the results of equation (1) on the *linkage between firm productivity, exporter status and industry export orientation towards Enlarged Europe*. Before interpreting the related results shown in the *Table 3*, it is worth explaining the reason why the Pooled model has been preferred, rather than the Fixed Effect (FE) and Random Effect (RE) models.

Firstly, we should consider that the RE model turns out to be theoretically the most appropriate for a case like ours, given that it treats firm's unobserved heterogeneity as a random variable and our sampled firms have been drawn from a large population. Anyhow, the results of the Breusch-Pagan test (506.68 [p-value 0.000]) and the Hausman test (67.49 [p-value 0.000]) lead to reject the RE model in our case. Hence, the choice is restricted between FE and Pooled model. As we can note the fixed effects are jointly statistically significant (7.04 [p-value 0.000]) and almost not correlated at all with explanatory variables ( $corr(\lambda_i, X_{ijt}) = 0.0329$ ), i.e. the unobserved time-invariant firm characteristics – such as technology and managerial capability – result to exert a certain influence on the firm productivity (dependent variable) without affecting almost at all the other observed firm traits. Thus, there would be all the requirements leading to prefer the FE model rather than the Pooled one.

---

<sup>33</sup> The problem of serial correlation concerns data very close over time: thus, it is negligible in our case, since we handle with enough distanced periods (2000 and 2003).

**Table 3 - Exports, productivity and market integration: Enlarged Europe (panel models)**

LP (dependent variable)	<i>Pooled</i>	<i>FE</i>	<i>RE</i>
T	-0.052 (2.10)*	-0.048 (3.71)**	-0.046 (3.69)**
EXPORTER	0.085 (2.94)**	-0.057 -1.42	0.033 -1.16
EU25	0.149 (2.41)*	-0.281 -1.48	0.088 -1.16
R&D	0.074 (2.84)**	0.019 -0.77	0.054 (2.57)*
K/L	0.002 (9.02)**	0 -0.53	0.001 (4.72)**
w/L	0.022 (14.63)**	0.019 (10.74)**	0.021 (15.22)**
Constant	11.017 (139.66)**	11.724 (58.51)**	11.193 (124.56)**
F-test for fixed effects		7.04 [0.000]	
corr(u_i, Xb)		0.0329	
BP test			506.68 [0.000]
Hausman test			67.49 [0.000]
Observations	2045	2045	2045
Number of id	1070	1070	1070
R-squared	0.17	0.12	

Absolute value of t statistics in parentheses  
P-value in squared brackets  
\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

However, we should bear in mind that in the former model, all firm-specific characteristics that are time invariant will be captured in the fixed effect, regardless of the fact that they have been observed or not. Thus, it would be impossible to study the impact of a dummy variable which assumes the same value over time, since it would be automatically dropped, e.g. the impact of firm location on firm performance. Now, if we consider the case where the dummy variable is quasi-time-constant – i.e. it does change from one period to the other, but solely for a very small portion of the observed sample – a coefficient will be estimated, but it is likely to be not very informative, given that most of the related effect will be captured by the fixed effect. This problem could concern our analysis since it is mainly aimed to unveil the relation between firm productivity and exporter status (dummy variable), and in our dataset only about 9% of firms change

exporter status in the period considered (as the *Table 2* shows). This is the reason why we have decided to focus on the Pooled model.

As we can observe from the *Table 3*, all the coefficients are statistically significant at a 5 percent level both individually and jointly – although  $R^2$  is not very high, indeed it suggests that about 17% of the variation in LP is explained by the included regressors – and the signs are consistent with our expectations.

Firms relatively abundant in physical capital and high-skilled human capital are more productive: indeed, firm's labour productivity rises by 0.2%<sup>34</sup>, if the capital-to-labour ratio goes up by one percentage point, on average and *ceteris paribus*; and by 2.2% following a one percentage point increase in wage per employee – which proxies the presence of highly-qualified workers – on average and *ceteris paribus*. Firms involved in R&D activities turn out to be more competitive, in particular, they gain 7.7% more in labour productivity, on average and *ceteris paribus*.

Now, we concentrate on the export-related coefficients: first of all, exporters turn out to be more productive than non-exporters and the *exporter productivity premium* is around 8.9%. Moreover, we can observe as the firms' productivity increases if they operate in the sectors relatively more export-oriented towards European markets – in particular, by 16.1%, on average and *ceteris paribus*, as a consequence of a one percentage point increase in the relative export propensity of their industry toward Enlarged Europe.

Hence, the results are exactly in line with theoretical expectations. The significance of the positive export productivity premium confirms that firms *self-select* into international markets (and/or *learn by exporting*). Furthermore, a higher export propensity towards European area within a sector, implies a higher economic performance of the firms belonging to that sector: this could be due to the fact that a fall in trade barriers leads the low-productivity firms to die, the high-productivity non-exporters to start serving foreign markets, and the existing exporters – already highly competitive – to increase their sales abroad, causing the reallocation of economic activities in favour of the best firms.

---

<sup>34</sup> All coefficients have been transformed through  $b = (e^{\beta} - 1) * 100$  in order to derive the compound rate of productivity growth respect to each single explanatory variable

Finally, the time dummy appears to be statistically significant and has a negative sign: thus, firm's labour productivity decreases by about 5.1% over the three-year period considered. This could be linked to some macroeconomic changes affecting the Italian economy altogether: for example, it could easily be connected to the introduction of the Euro currency taken place in 2000. For this reason, now we move to comment the results of the same equation (1) with alternative industry export orientation indexes – EU15 and EMU12 in substitution of EU25 – in order to explore the relationship between firm performance, exporting and the different levels of market integration. Once again, we have run the related panel models (*Table 4* and *Table 5*), but just analysed the Pooled results, for the reasons discussed in relation to the *Table 3*.

**Table 4 - Exports, productivity and market integration: European Union (panel models)**

LP (dependent variable)	<i>Pooled</i>	<i>FE</i>	<i>RE</i>
T	-0.051 (2.08)*	-0.046 (3.54)**	-0.046 (3.63)**
EXPORTER	0.085 (2.96)**	-0.056 -1.4	0.034 -1.2
EU15	0.163 (2.91)**	-0.136 -0.84	0.112 -1.65
R&D	0.076 (2.89)**	0.02 -0.82	0.055 (2.60)**
K/L	0.002 (8.97)**	0 -0.54	0.001 (4.69)**
w/L	0.022 (14.68)**	0.019 (10.73)**	0.021 (15.24)**
Constant	11.001 (148.66)**	11.576 (66.94)**	11.167 (134.57)**
F-test for fixed effects		7.01 [0.000]	
corr(u_i, Xb)		0.0668	
BP test			506.00 [0.000]
Hausman test			65.80 [0.000]
Observations	2045	2045	2045
Number of id	1070	1070	1070
R-squared	0.17	0.12	

Absolute value of t statistics in parentheses

P-value in squared brackets

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

**Table 5 - Exports, productivity and market integration: Eurozone (panel models)**

LP (dependent variable)	<i>Pooled</i>	<i>FE</i>	<i>RE</i>
T	-0.053 (2.14)*	-0.042 (3.36)**	-0.046 (3.72)**
EXPORTER	0.087 (3.01)**	-0.055 -1.37	0.035 -1.23
EMU12	0.161 (2.95)**	0.073 -0.49	0.136 (2.07)*
R&D	0.076 (2.89)**	0.021 -0.86	0.055 (2.62)**
K/L	0.002 (8.99)**	0 -0.51	0.001 (4.70)**
w/L	0.022 (14.64)**	0.019 (10.73)**	0.021 (15.25)**
Constant	11.003 (151.19)**	11.365 (70.56)**	11.142 (137.88)**
F-test for fixed effects		7.01 [0.000]	
corr(u_i, Xb)		0.0967	
BP test			506.48 [0.000]
Hausman test			63.11 [0.000]
Observations	2045	2045	2045
Number of id	1070	1070	1070
R-squared	0.17	0.12	

Absolute value of t statistics in parentheses

P-value in squared brackets

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

We should mind the coefficients of EU25, EU15 and EMU12 in the respective tables – taking into account anyhow that all estimators are statistically significant and with right signs – which reflect the firm labour productivity if we just allow for the relative industry export propensity towards Enlarged Europe-25, European Union-15 and Eurozone-12, respectively. By comparing these coefficients, we can notice that:

$$0 \leq \hat{\beta}_{EU25} \leq \hat{\beta}_{EU15} \cong \hat{\beta}_{EMU12}$$

i.e. Those firms whose industries are relatively more export-oriented towards more integrated markets have on average higher productivity.

In particular, as we have seen above the firm's labour productivity rises by 16.1%, on average and *ceteris paribus*, if the relative sector propensity to export towards Enlarged Europe increases by one percentage point. Now, we can observe as the firm's labour productivity growth turns out to be higher when we consider the relative industry tendency to serve European Union's markets (around 17.7%). Whereas, when we allow for the relative industry export propensity towards Eurozone, the productivity change fairly remains the same as the one reported in the European Union case (17.5%) – probably because three years from the introduction of Euro currency is not enough to show the 'Euro-effect'.

In addition, in all the three cases, the exporters turn out to be more productive than non exporters, by 8.9% on average and *ceteris paribus*. Thus, the 'relative export productivity premium' (the LP gap respect to the firm average productivity) tends to be lower as we focus on more integrated markets, stressing that the domestic productivity cutoff grows more rapidly than the export productivity cutoff, respect to the respective original points, when the market becomes more integrated. In fact, the former is pushed solely upwards, through the further competitive pressure from foreign agents (pro-competitive effect). Whereas, the latter is pushed both downwards (due to the fall in trade costs) and upwards (because of the increased competition within the international market) simultaneously, and the net effect depends on the combination of these two mechanisms: i.e. we can even hypothetically see a decrease in export productivity cutoff – if the first mechanism prevails – or conversely, an increase if the second mechanism is predominant, which will somehow be to a smaller extent compared with the rise in domestic productivity cutoff. In other words, the two-cutoffs come progressively near as the extent of market integration further increases, until they will exactly coincide with a single value (European cutoff) within a single totally integrated international market (European market), which will take on the same characteristics as a larger domestic market (like US market) (see again the *Box 1*).

Hence, we can reach the conclusion that the market integration mechanism is much more relevant than the market enlargement process, since the former benefits further the positive relationship between exports and productivity, especially when we shift from 'shallow' to 'deep' integration.

In practise, the removal of (tariff and non-tariff) trade barriers – such as through the constitution of a *Custom Union* – makes the international market more attractive and thus, induces the most productive domestic firms to consider the chance to become exporters or to intensify their exports towards new and/or old foreign markets, which in turn, leads them to improve further their performance (according to the Self-Selection hypothesis). At the same time, the least productive firms are forced to stop activity, being unable to contend with foreign competitors (import competition effect). Thus, business reallocation from low-performance firms to highly-productive firms occurs, causing an increase in average aggregate productivity. In addition, we must not neglect the positive externalities from exporters to non-exporters through knowledge transfer and business backward and forward linkages (the so-called export spillovers). All these effects will tend to enhance if, along with obstacles related to the movement of goods, barriers linked to the movement of capital and people are removed – such as through the creation of a *Single Market* – since that would allow a more efficient and effective allocation of resources (such as capital and labour) across borders according to the peculiar productive vocations of several territories. Finally, this ongoing process of productive specialization makes firms and territories increasingly interdependent and interrelated amongst them, therefore, the need of common policies is progressively more felt through, for instance, the establishment of an *Economic and Monetary Union* – implying the introduction of a single currency, and thus the removal of further barriers – which will tend over time to move closer to distinctive traits of an out-and-out *Political Union*.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper participates in the intense debate about the relationship between trade and firm performance, taking into account firm heterogeneity and the role of trade policy. In detail, we analysed the exporting-productivity linkage and how it may be affected by the increasing and apparently unstoppable process of international economic integration, through a recent literature review, and a new empirical evidence on Italian manufacturing sector. In general, our empirical results turn out to be coherent with theoretical predictions emphasized by Meltiz-Ottaviano model (2008).



Firstly, we have documented that exporters are more productive than firms oriented solely to the domestic market, i.e. the existence of the so-called *export productivity premium*. Secondly, we have found that, on average, firm productivity increases as the relative industry exports rise towards more and more integrated – although progressively smaller – markets. Indeed, Italian firms’ average productivity assumes higher value in the industries with the highest export propensity towards Eurozone (Economic and Monetary Union – 12 MSs) and European Union (Single Market – 15 MSs). Whereas, it is lower as the market borders are extended to further geographical areas but less interrelated, i.e. when the industry export tendency towards Enlarged Europe (Custom Union – 25 MSs) is considered. Our results seem to be in line with findings achieved by Bernard et al. (2006) – who have empirically highlighted as a fall in trade costs within industry would imply intra-industry business reallocation at the expenses of the low-productive firms and in favour of the high-performance exporters – and Corcos et al. (2007) – who have shown that further EU integration would entail relevant benefits in terms of firm productivity.

Hence, the policy-makers of countries engaged in a Regional Trade Agreement (RTA) should rely on “deeper integration” policies (i.e. total removal of each sort of international barrier) rather than – or before – thinking to involve new countries in RTA (enlargement market process). In this way, firms in each Member State (such as Italy, in this study) will become progressively more productive, and consequently, an increasing portion of them will also be able to compete with extra-RTA firms (*non-European firms*) both inside and outside the RTA markets (*European markets*). Of course, this mechanism will be maximized, as the involved markets will be completely integrated, i.e. when they will really merge into a single larger market (*European market*), whose – almost all – firms (*European firms*) will have all necessary requirements to face the extra-regional competition (*Extra-European competition*) both internally and externally.

Finally, we are aware that our analysis is not absolutely exhaustive, since the same topic could be explored through different approaches and econometric methodologies, different productivity and trade measures, and larger datasets including higher number of firms, more years, many more characteristics of firms under both general and internationalization profiles. Indeed, our analysis is based on firm-level dataset composed by only two years, devoid of information about trade intensity or trade

destination for which we were forced to use industry-level data. These are some sufficient reasons that motivate us to deepen further our work in the future.

However, as well as confirming earlier studies about the existence the export-productivity linkage, this paper makes a contribution to the recent literature aimed at emphasizing the role of ‘market integration’, in addition to ‘market size’ one, in the relationship between international trade and economic performance. It would be really interesting to extend empirically our analysis to FDI flows – by also discriminating between multinational firms and local ones – since they play an equally important role in a context of advanced market integration, as European integration one.

## References

- Andersson, M., S. Johansson and H. Lööf (2007), 'Firm performance and international trade - evidence from a small open economy'. *Electronic Working Paper Series 99, CESIS*.
- Aw, B.J., M.J Roberts, and T. Winston, (2007), 'Export Market Participation, Investments in R&D and Worker Training, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity. *The World Economy*, 30(1): 83-104.
- Bellone, F., P. Musso, L. Nesta and F. Warzynski (2008), 'Endogenous Markups, Firm Productivity and International Trade: A Test of the Melitz-Ottaviano Model'. *Preliminary version*.
- Baldwin, R. and C. Wyplosz (2006), 'The Economics of European Integration'. *McGraw Hill*.
- Bernard, A. B., J. Eaton, J. B. Jensen and S. Kortum (2003), 'Plants and Productivity in International Trade'. *American Economic Review*, 93(4):1268-1290.
- Bernard, A., S. Redding and P. Schott (2007), 'Comparative advantage and heterogeneous firms'. *Review of Economics Studies*, 73(1): 31-66.
- Bernard, A. B. and J. B. Jensen (1995), 'Exporters, Jobs, and Wages in U.S. Manufacturing: 1976-1987'. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity: Microeconomics*, 67-119.
- Bernard, A. B., J. B. Jensen and P. K. Schott (2006), 'Trade Costs, Firms and Productivity'. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 53(5):917-937.
- Bernard, A. B., J. B. Jensen, S. J. Redding and P. K. Schott (2007), 'Firms in International Trade'. NBER Working Papers 13054, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Capitalia (2002), 'Indagine sulle Imprese Manifatturiere. Ottavo Rapporto sull'Industria Italiana e sulla Politica Industriale', *Rome*.
- Capitalia (2005), 'Indagine sulle Imprese Manifatturiere. Nono Rapporto sull'Industria Italiana e sulla Politica Industriale', *Rome*.
- Castellani, D., F. Serti and C. Tomasi (2008), 'Firms in international trade: Importers and exporters heterogeneity in the Italian manufacturing industry'. *Working Paper 2008-04, Laboratory of Economics and Management*.
- Chaney, T. (2007), 'Distorted gravity: the intensive and extensive margins of international trade. Working paper'. *University of Chicago*.
- Corcos, G., Del Gatto M., Mion G. and Ottaviano G. I.P. (2007), 'Productivity and Firm Selection: Intra- vs International Trade'. *Working Paper CRENoS 200706, Centre for North South Economic Research, University of Cagliari and Sassari*
- Damijan, J., S. Polanec and J. Prasnikar (1998), 'Self-selection, export market heterogeneity and productivity improvements: firm-level evidence from Slovenia'. *Working Paper 14804, LICOS- Centre for Transition Economics*.
- De Hoyos, R.E. and L. Iacovone (2006), 'The Impact of NAFTA on Economic Performance: A Firm-Level Analysis of the Trade and Productivity Channels'. *Working paper, IADB*.
- Del Gatto, M., Mion G. and Ottaviano G. I. P. (2006), 'Trade Integration, Firm Selection and the Costs of Non-Europe'. *CEPR Discussion Papers 5730, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers*.

- Feenstra, R. C. (2004), 'Advanced International Trade: Theory and Evidence'. *Princeton University Press*.
- Greenaway, D. and R. Kneller (2005), 'Firm Heterogeneity, Exporting and Foreign Direct Investment: A Survey'. *Economic Journal, Royal Economic Society*, 117(517): F134-F161, 02.
- Greenaway, D. and Z. Yu (2004), 'Firm-level Interactions between Exporting and Productivity: Industry-Specific Evidence'. *Review of World Economics*, 140(3): 376–92.
- Greene, W. H. (2003), 'Econometric Analysis'. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, *Prentice Hall*.
- Gujarati, D. N. (2004), 'Basic Econometrics'. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, *McGraw-Hill*.
- Helpman, E., M. J. Melitz and S. R. Yeaple (2004), 'Export versus FDI with Heterogeneous Firms'. *American Economic Review*, 94(1), 300–16.
- Helpman, E., M. Melitz and Y. Rubinstein (2007), 'Estimating trade flows: trading partners and trading values'. *Working Paper 12927, NBER*.
- Imbruno, M. (2008), 'International trade and firm productivity within the Italian manufacturing sector: Self-selection or Learning-by-exporting?'. *Quaderni DSEMS 21/2008, Dipartimento di Scienze Economiche, Matematiche e Statistiche, Università di Foggia*.
- Lileeva, A. and D. Trefler (2007), 'Improved access to foreign markets raises plant-level productivity'. *Working Paper 13297, NBER*.
- Long, Ngo Van & Raff, Horst & Stähler, Frank, (2007), 'The Effects of Trade Liberalization on Productivity and Welfare: The Role of Firm Heterogeneity, R&D and Market Structure'. *Economics working papers 2007,20, Christian-Albrechts-University of Kiel, Department of Economics*.
- López, R. A. (2005), 'Trade and Growth: Reconciling the Macroeconomic and Microeconomic Evidence'. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(4): 623-48.
- Machin, S. (1996), 'Changes in the Relative Demand for Skills in the UK Labour Market', *Chapter 7 in A. Booth and D. Snower (eds.) Acquiring Skills: Market Failures, Their Symptoms and Policy Responses, Cambridge University Press*.
- Melitz, M. J. and G. I. P. Ottaviano (2008), 'Market Size, Trade, and Productivity'. *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(1):295-316.
- Melitz, M. J. (2003), 'The Impact of Trade on Intra-industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity', *Econometrica*, 71(6):1695–725.
- Morone, P., C. Petraglia and G. Testa (2007), 'Research, Knowledge Spillovers and Innovation: Evidence from the Italian Manufacturing Sector', *Birkbeck Working Papers in Economics and Finance 703/2007*.
- Pavitt, K. (1984), 'Sectoral patterns of technical change: Towards a taxonomy and a theory'. *Research Policy*, 13:33–45.
- Rodrik, D. (1997), 'Trade strategy, investment and exports: another look at East Asia'. *Pacific Economic Review*, 2:1–24.
- Serti, F. and C. Tomasi (2008), 'Firm Heterogeneity: do destinations of exports and origins of imports matter?'. *Working paper, Laboratory of Economics and Management*.
- Trefler, D. (2004), 'The Long and Short of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement'. *American Economic Review*, 94:870-895.

- Tybout, J. R. (2003), 'Plant- and Firm-Level Evidence on "New Trade Theories'. In *Handbook of International Trade*, ed. E. K. Choi and J. Harrigan. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, chapter 13.
- The International Study Group on Export and Productivity (2007), 'Exports and productivity. Comparable evidence for 14 countries'. *Research Paper Series 41, GEP, University of Nottingham* (or *Policy Research Working Paper Series 4418, the World Bank*).
- Wagner, J. (2007a), 'Exports and productivity: A survey of the evidence from firm-level data'. *The World Economy*, 30(1):60–82.
- Wagner, J. (2007b), 'Productivity and Size of the Export Market - Evidence for West and East German Plants, 2004'. *Working Paper Series in Economics 43, University of Lüneburg, Institute of Economics*.
- Yeaple, S. R. (2005), 'A Simple Model of Firm Heterogeneity, International Trade, and Wages'. *Journal of International Economics*, 65(1):1–20.

**Appendix 1** – *Table of ‘Converted’ industry codes from Ateco 1991 to Ateco 2002’ classification*

FROM 4 (or 5)-digit level Ateco 1991	TO 3-digit level Ateco 2002
1773	182
1774	182
1775	182
2735	271
28755	352
29561	292
29562	292
29564	294
35114	371